## BRENEMAN & GEORGES

Attorneys and Counselors at Law 3150 Commonwealth Ave, Alexandria, VA 22305 Tel.: (703) 683-8006 Fax: (703) 683-8009

# **FACSIMILE**

To: Examiner Riggleman (571)-273-5935

From: Patrick R. Delaney, Esq.

Date: October 10, 2007

Re: 10/849,030 - Courtesy Copy of AF Amendment and

Statement of Substance of Interview filed on

October 9, 2007

Pages: fourteen (14) including cover

#### PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
In re Patent Application of:

DR. KLAUS ZUCHOLL, ROLAND SCHMALZ and ELMAR OTT

U.S. Serial No.: 10/849,030

Group Art Unit: 1746

Filed: May 20, 2004

Examiner: Jason Paul Riggleman

For: HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCE

October 9, 2007

# STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Honorable Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.133(b), Applicants supplement the description of the interview conducted on October 3, 2007, between Examiner Riggleman and Patrick R. Delaney, Esq. The differences between the invention and the prior art was discussed, including particularly Chan et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,500,050. The other prior art cited in the final Office Action was not specifically discussed as the discussion focused upon claims 16 and 17, against which only Chan et al. was applied.

It was explained that in Chan et al., only fresh water from an outside water source was used to dissolve the detergent in the apparatus disclosed in that reference and explained that claim 16 DR. KLAUS ZUCHOLL, et al. U.S. Application Serial No.: 10/849,030

could be modified to conform more closely to the embodiment disclosed in figure 1 of the specification by incorporating language reflecting a washing area, a first wash liquid circuit and a second wash liquid circuit. Examiner Riggleman agreed that this would help distinguish claim 16 from Chan et al.

Examiner Riggleman was very helpful in explaining his preference for adding certain other elements to claim 16, and modifying select other terms to avoid any potential issue with a term being indefinite. He explained his preference for the term partial flow in claim 16 and asked that claim 16 be modified to include a sensor element. Examiner Riggleman also noted that the conduit in element (c) of claim 16 was preferably specified as a bypass conduit. He also explained that the term connecting as used in claim 16 might be indefinite and asked that it be replaced with the alternative language, in fluid connection with, to clarify the meaning of that term.

In addition, Ex. Riggleman pointed out that a controller is normally programmed to have a function carried out rather than performing an actual function itself and asked that the controller element in claim 16 be modified to reflect this.

At the end of the interview, Examiner Riggleman was also very helpful in volunteering to further consider a claim amendment that incorporated the proposed limitations discussed during the course of the interview.

Examiner Riggleman's time and effort in advancing the prosecution of this application is very much appreciated by Applicants and the undersigned attorney.

DR. KLAUS ZUCHOLL, et al. U.S. Application Serial No.: 10/849,030

Respectfully submitted,

BRENEMAN & GEORGES

Ву

Patrick R. Delawey

Reg. No. 45,338

3150 Commonwealth Avenue

Alexandria, VA 22305 Tel.: (703) 683-8006 Fax: (703) 683-8009

### PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

DR. KLAUS ZUCHOLL, ROLAND SCHMALZ and ELMAR OTT

U.S. Serial No.: 10/849,030 Group Art Unit: 1746

Filed: May 20, 2004

Examiner: Jason Paul Riggleman

For: HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCE

October 9, 2007

### AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

Honorable Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the final Office Action mailed July 11, 2007, which time for response expires October 11, 2007, please consider the following remarks as well as differences between the invention and prior art as incorporated in the amended claims and amend the claims as indicated in the Listing of Claims.